

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 JOSE E. FALU-MENDOZA,

1:11-cv-01003 SKO (HC)

12  
13 Petitioner,

ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO THE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

14 vs.

15 JAMES D. HARTLEY, Warden,

16  
17 Respondent.  
18 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
19

20 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a habeas corpus action pursuant to 28  
21 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

22 The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity  
23 jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants  
24 reside in the same state, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions  
25 giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is  
26 situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which  
27 the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

28 In this case, the petitioner is challenging a conviction from Los Angeles County, which is in the

1 Central District of California. Therefore, the petition should have been filed in the United States District  
2 Court for the Central District of California. In the interest of justice, a federal court may transfer a case  
3 filed in the wrong district to the correct district. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d  
4 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the United States  
6 District Court for the Central District of California.IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 **Dated: June 21, 2011**

**/s/ Sheila K. Oberto**  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE